

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/343,684	06/30/1999	ALICJA BORYSOWICZ	1029/182	8228
75	590 04/09/2002			
MORRIS LISS POLLOCK VANDE SANDE & AMERNICK RLLP P O BOX 19088			EXAMINER	
			VINCENT, SEAN E	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 200363425		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1731	10
			DATE MAILED: 04/09/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1	D_
<b>A</b> -		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action		09/343,684	BORYSOWICZ ET AL.	
	Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Sean E Vincent	1731	
The M	AILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
Therefore, furthe inal rejection ur condition for alle	ED 26 March 2002 FAILS TO PLACE or action by the applicant is required to ander 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (bwance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appetic in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of t (1) a timely filed amend	ment which places the application in	Ė
·		EPLY [check either a) o	r b)]	
a) 🛛 The peri	od for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date $0$	of the final rejection.		_
event, ho ONLY CI 706.07(f) Extensions of ti nave been filed is the B7 CFR 1.17(a) is co b) above, if checked	od for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adwever, will the statutory period for reply expire later the HECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS and the may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The declared for purposes of determining the period of extend acculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened. Any reply received by the Office later than three midjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	han SIX MONTHS from the many of the many of the many of the many of the petition under the corresponding and the corresponding and the corresponding and statutory period for reply original for reply original contents.	alling date of the final rejection.  "HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  "37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee mount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee unitinally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort!	e der h in
1. A Notice 37 CFR 1	of Appeal was filed on Appellan .192(a), or any extension thereof (37 Cl	t's Brief must be filed w FR 1.191(d)), to avoid c	ithin the period set forth in lismissal of the appeal.	
2. The prop	osed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:	•	
(a) 🔲 they	raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/o	r search (see NOTE below);	
(b) They	raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
issu	are not deemed to place the application es for appeal; and/or			the
	y present additional claims without cance TE:	eling a corresponding n	umber of finally rejected claims.	
	's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s): <u>112 rejections</u> .		
4. Newly pr	oposed or amended claim(s) wou g the non-allowable claim(s).		tted in a separate, timely filed amendm	ent
5 ⊠ The a)	affidavit, b)  exhibit, or c)  request to a	for reconsideration has See Continuation Sheet.	been considered but does NOT place th	те
6. ☐ The affid	avit or exhibit will NOT be considered by the Examiner in the final rejection.		SOLELY to issues which were newly	
7 🕅 For nurn	oses of Appeal, the proposed amendme tion of how the new or amended claims	ent(s) a) will not be er would be rejected is pro	ntered or b)⊠ will be entered and an ovided below or appended.	
The state	us of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	rs:		
Claim(s	allowed:			
•	) objected to:			
Claim(s	) rejected: <u>10 and 12-18</u> .			
Claim(s	) withdrawn from consideration:			
	oosed drawing correction filed on 29 Aug			iine
9. Note the	attached Information Disclosure Staten	nent(s)( PTO-1449) Par	per No(s).	
10.  Other: _			Sean E Vincent Primary Examiner	
			Art Unit: 1731	

•

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims are obvious over Aoki in view of Victor et al and further in view of Miller. Applicant has not addressed paragraphs 11 and 13 in the final rejection while presenting the same arguments.